DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 166 24 CG 004 208

By-Giammatteo, Michael C.; Westling, Louise

Theoretical and Research Treatment of Community Organization and Interagency Cooperation.

Northwest Regional Educational Lab., Portland, Oreg.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Research.
Bureau No-BR-6-2871
Pub Date 68
Contract-OEC-4-7-062871-3059
Note-46p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.40
Descriptors-*Community Leaders, *Community Role, *Community Size, *Community Study, Interaction, Interagency Cooperation, *Leadership, Political Power, Population Trends, Residential Patterns

Nine hypotheses, employing community power as the single dependent variable and arranged under three categories of independent variables, are advanced. These categories are as follows: (1) Methodological Characteristics, (2) Demographic Characteristics, and (3) Economic Characteristics. The following results were obtained: (1) The type of power structure identified by studies that rely on a single method may well be artifacts of that method. (2) Social integration and region, variables which reflect something of the political life of the community, show some association with power structure; and (3) Economic variables reflecting patterns characteristic of increasing industrialization and moderately associated with less concentrated power structures. Implications and a review of literature are included. (Author/CJ)

EDO30166

BR6-2871
PA-24
OE-BR

THEORETICAL AND RESEARCH TREATMENT OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

Submitted by

Michael C. Giammatteo
Research and Development Specialist

Louise Westling
Research Associate

Field Paper No. 23
1968

The substance of this paper was developed for support of Program 200: Intercultural Programs. Preparation of this paper was performed pursuant to contract No. OEC-4-7-062871-3059 with the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare under provisions of the Laboratory Program, Bureau of Research.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory
400 Lindsay Building, 710 S. W. Second Avenue
Portland, Oregon 97204

CG004208

THEORETICAL AND RESEARCH TREATMENT OF COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND INTERAGENCY COOPERATION

Michael C. Giammatteo

INTRODUCTION

Community problems "appear" to have a strong, almost unbending tendency to remain more or less dormant for many years, prior to their sudden emergence as critical issues and potential research areas. Few problems illustrate this tendency more clearly than does the area of interagency cooperation. Seldom does one read a Request for Proposal when the concept of cooperative effort on the part of local agencies is not a specific recommendation. Any local newspaper reveals to the reader hundreds of various pleas for community-agency cooperation. Groups of people from any walk of life eventually get around to the problems of duplication and waste in government and state programs run for local citizens' benefits. Often the simplistic plea for more cooperation falls on ears not unresponsive, but ignorant of some of the basic theoretical considerations required for such successful cooperation. This paper discusses definitions of community organization and community and will also attempt to review selected references that might aid the reader. Specific efforts of methodology and of community cooperation will be included in the closing section.

Community studies have come to be an important preoccupation of political scientists and sociologists since World War II. Every year the professional literature in this area increases, and other disciplines such as anthropology and education are discovering its relevance for their own concerns. Educators especially view community studies as important theoretical bases for their actions and their plans. Before we can coherently discuss recent research in the field, we must make clear what is meant by a community organization, and interagency cooperation and as a community tend to

determine, as far as possible in dealing with such a complex and elusive phenomenon, the present nature of the community in America and the forms it is likely to take in the future.

Defining "Community Organization," "Interagency Cooperation" and "Community"

There are many meanings to the phrase "community organization." It has been variously defined as (a) a dynamic group, (b) a static group, (c) a set of conditions or (d) a process. For our purposes a community organization is one that is recognized by potential groups with whom it must negotiate. A Parent and Teachers Association group could become at any one time a legitimate community organization. That is, it may negotiate with the highway department for more school safety signs.

The phrase "interagency cooperation" will mean any contact during the process of building up to a negotiated action.

The ambiguity so characteristic of community studies particularly in sociology, which will be obvious as this discussion progresses, is apparent in the difficulty of finding a definition of community with which most of its students will agree. Terry N. Clark argues that sociologists use such a generalized definition of "community" that accurate comparative studies and consistent analysis and use of the research data in the field are impossible. Results of research undertaken in a rural hamlet are hardly useful or applicable to the study of large urban communities, though both social units fall under the same name.[1] Clark suggests that communities be classified according to the Bales and Parsons or AGIL typology, that is, according to functions: Adaptation, Goal-Attainment, Integration, and Latent Pattern-Maintenance and Tension-Management. The following chart demonstrates his conception of such a classification.

PARTIAL TYPOLOGY OF COMMUNITY[2]
CLASSIFIED ACCORDING TO FUNCTION

	A Economy	G Policy	I Legal Profession Political Parties Interest Groups	L Family Educational System
1. Partially Autonomous Community	+	+	+	+
2. Residential Community Politically autonomous Ecomomically independent	-	+	+	+
3. Residential Community Economically independent Politically independent	-	-	-	+
4. Residential Community Politically dependent Economically autonomous	+	-	-	+
5. Nonresidential Community Economically autonomous Politically dependent	+	-	-	-
6. Nonresidential Community Economically autonomous Politically autonomous	+	+	+	-

By using such a typology, sociologists and educators can more precisely compare and synthesize their findings.

Clark's suggestion is perhaps more valuable in its methodological implications for professional social scientists than it is for our purpose here, but it demonstrates the problem in the field of community studies. Conrad M. Arensberg and Solon T. Kimball provide a clear theoretical definition of "community" in a recent number of the American Journal of Sociology. Arensberg defines the community as

> "...the minimal unit table of organization of the personnel who can carry and transmit this culture. It is the minimal unit realizing the categories and offices of their social organization. It is the minimal group capable of re-enacting in the present and transmitting to the future the cultural and institutional inventory of their distinctive and historic tradition."[3]

A more practical definition is offered by Robert A. Dentler.

> "...a community supplies a georgraphical and psychological focus for institutional arrangements. A community is a place within which one finds all or most of the economic, political, religious, and familial institutions around which people group to cooperate, compete, or conflict."[4]

Community organization, our special focus, is defined by British sociologist D. F. Swift, in an effort to overcome the kinds of difficulty to which Clark referred, as

> "...the process by which the social system of the community provides for the integration and adaptation within the community. This is a process which continues regardless of the work of the community organizer whose function it is to initiate, nourish, and develop this process. In participating in this process the community organizer will have regard for certain values relating to the forms of social change and the means by which they may be brought about."

Subsidiary definitions to this major one are:

1. The social system is the network of social relations between status-positions of the social groups within the community

2. Integration is the extent to which the group members get from one another the attitudes, services, and goods they need

3. "adaptation refers to the extent to which the groups (sic) as a whole gets from other groups the attitudes, services, and goods its members need, and the extent to which it gets from its environment the things it needs."[5]

These three definitions, representing three slightly different approaches to the idea of community, can serve as a basis for a discussion of recent community research.

Robert A. Dentler's American Community Problems presents a useful overall view of the present nature of the community in the United States, insofar as such generalizations are possible. The occasional oversimplification and vagueness do not detract from the usefulness of this work. Dentler sees the standard or typical community in urban terms; for the sake of discussion, he does not include the small rural town as part of his major emphasis. The characteristic community structure in Dentler's view, therefore, is a metropolitan core or "central city," surrounded by subcommunities linked with each other and the central city in a web or webs of interdependence.[6] The principle involved in the formation of such urban communities or Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas, is that of metropolitan dominance which has operated more and more in the United States in past years.

> "The central city tended to monopolize a progressively broader range of commercial and cultural services, while other localities within the area became dependent consumers and support structures for the maintenance of these services."[7]

Within these complex communities the phenomenon of locality-specilization is common. Particular kinds of industries and businesses tend to concentrate in distinct areas. Banking districts, dock areas, garment-retailing districts, and educational areas are typical examples. In the case of New York City, strings of satellite cities and suburbs constitute a vast network of providers of industrial, residential, and recreational services. Some cities in New Jersey provide a concentration of heavy industry and industrial supply areas, while others supply docking, storage, portage, and manufacture. Cities across the river in New York State are residential and resort centers.[8] (Dentler's concepts might lead one to claim that all of New Jersey, part of Pennsylvania, Connecticut, and New York are included in one community. Limits are not easily set with such a concept. The fact of interdependence must be seen as a tentative basis for the determination of community boundaries because one might conclude the whole nation is one community.

The situation of the American community is not as clearly defined as the above description might indicate. Ease of transportation, particularly private transportation, has called into question the vital importance of the central city. Suburban shopping centers, the development of almost self-sufficient subcommunities on the peripheries of the SMSA, and the convenience of the telephone have brought about decentralization and the erosion of central city dominance.[9] Many cities are forced to expend great effort to make the central city attractive and competitive with suburban shopping and business areas in order to prevent its deterioration and possible death.

Another determining factor in the nature of the central city and indeed of the whole complex metropolitan community is the phenomenon of absentee ownership of large businesses and industries. Corporations pursue policies designed to

benefit themselves regionally or nationally without consideration of the interests of local municipalities in which they have located plants. These policies often conflict with local concerns and indeed may change the local community significantly without its inhabitants having any voice in the matter.[10]

Within the individual community, problems of jurisdiction and boundary cause confusion and conflict. This is a structural problem because it involves the tangling of the organizational lines and limits of government agencies and private institutions. Dentler writes of the problem in a suburban setting.

> "One can imagine achieving consensus within a single suburban community, but here there are several units controlling several functions, and each one involves a local, regional, state, and perhaps national hierarchy of its own. Each agency will have its own view of its authority and mandate and therefore its own view of the public interest."[11]

Metropolitan areas embody a bewildering maze of physical boundaries as well: residential zones, county-city-township lines, commercial boundaries, institutional boundaries, school district, etc. Any sophisticated attempt at describing community organization and interagency interaction must account for this structural complexity. The weakness in sociological attempts to deal with community structure, as we shall see, is the naive and simplistic level at which research must operate because of the relative newness of the field.

Dentler also discusses the unequal distribution of power shares in community politics and places the blame for ghetto unrest and the resulting riots upon this problem.[12]

The future structure of American society and of the American community depends to a great extent upon population trends. Philip M. Hauser and Martin Taitel, basing their predictions on the 1960 census, forecast a population of over

300 million Americans by the turn of the century.[13] By 1980 the population is expected to increase by 47.3 million, 95% or about 45 million of which will be living in metropolitan areas. "By 1980, of some 170 million people in metropolitan areas, about 100 million are projected to be in suburbs, about 70 million in central cities."[14] Hauser and Taitel maintain that the general health of the future urban community depends upon the alertness and constructive action of its inhabitants.

> "The spacial patterning of the physical residential plant of metropolitan areas, with its correlative socio-economic stratification of the population, is likely to be drastically modified. It is possible that, while the obsolescent inner areas are replaced or renovated, decay will occur in the suburban rings. With increased intervention and urban renewal programs, it is likely that the physical and socio-economic character of a community in the future will depend less upon the historical accident of its origin and more upon the will of organized population groups as manifest in their planning and development activities."[15]

Rural population is expected to continue to decline, so that by 1980, fewer than 10 million persons will be living on farms.[16] These projections support Dentler's almost exclusive emphasis upon the urban community.

In line with the above predictions is the position of John Friedman and John Miller regarding the nature of the basic unit of the American community in the future.

> "We forsee a new scale of urban living that will extend far beyond metropolitan cores and penetrate deeply into the peripheries. Relations of dominance and dependency will be transcended. The older established centers, together with the metropolitan peripheries that envelop them, will constitute the new ecological unit of America's postindustrial society....This basic element of emerging spacial core we shall call the urban field."[17]

In "The American Partnership: the Next Half-Generation" Daniel J. Elazar comments upon intergovernmental and intragovernmental relationships of the

future. He maintains that, because such a large array of federal grants are available to states and their subdivisions that they can pick and choose among them, they "have developed greater flexibility within the framework of the grant programs now than in the past."[18] The immediate future will see continuing growth in the size and scope of all levels of governmental activity, and an increase in the already pervasive cooperation and interaction of local, state and federal governments, as well as federal-private relations.[19]

Some concern (imagined or real) for the maintenance of the importance of state governments lies in the increasing trend of the federal government toward dealing directly with specific localities rather than operating through the intermediary of state government. It is paradoxical that Elazar sees a basis for hope in this very tendency.

> "However, the very thrust towards regionalism indicates that sheer federal-local relations will not be sufficient to handle the dispersal of power and operational activity which is considered desirable in this country."[20]

There is clearly an important role to be played by state government in coordinating power and activity within its geographical jurisdiction.

> "Not only states, but localities as well, will have to struggle to maintain autonomy in the emerging governmental field. Centralizing goals inherent in many federal programs cause pressures which are directed towards eliminating local policy-making powers, particularly in the realms of housing, zoning, and urban development."[21]

William L. L. Wheaton discusses the problem of local governmental strength from a slightly different perspective, that of the problem of boundary confusion with which Dentler dealt. The weakening effects of such confusion, he maintains, can be avoided by the creation of metropolitan systems of overall policy control which will provide for the maintenance of minimum

levels of basic services for the metropolitan area as a whole and which will be entrusted with the responsibility of planning for the future. Local governments within the SMSA would have jurisdiction over purely local problems and functions, while

> "...the more important metropolitan functions such as transportation, land use control, the location and development of industry and higher education are performed by a metropolitan area-wide government."[22]

Such systems are already in operation in London and Toronto. Wheaton argues further that the United States should follow the lead of Britain, France, and the Scandanavian countries in systematic city-planning.[23] This author is in sympathy with Wheaton and has recommended a systematic approach to facilitate meeting total community educational needs. (Field Paper #14)

Such planning, as well as the alleviation of community problems now existing, must rely at least in part on a theoretical understanding of community organization. Conrad M. Arensberg and Solon T. Kimball, in "Community Study: Retrospect and Prospect," write that gradually social scientists have recognized that "...the community offers the most significant focus, the most viable form of human grouping, for directed innovation, for massive and continuous stimulation of cultural change."[24] Unfortunately social scientists have turned their attention and their research machinery to the American community only relatively recently. Most research in urban community organization in the past five years has been the work of sociologists. An examination of their published findings makes it very clear that the field is in its infancy. Research so far has established only rather simplistic principles of community structure, and even these principles are the subjects of controversy. As yet, very little is really known about community structure. A valid and

sophisticated methodology must be developed and a vast amount of comparative work must be done before sociologists can begin to provide really useful community theory.

Arensberg and Kimball differentiate between traditional sociology and community study by maintaining that the traditional sociological premise of the function of a custom or institution is "service to the support of society or its contribution to the management of the emotions, sentiments, needs and supports of society's constituent individuals," whereas community studies are based on the idea that function is "interdependence within the context of the whole."[25]

As previously stated, sociological methodology for community study is in a formative and rather controversial stage of development. Most recent research has focused upon the discovery of leadership in specific communities and the determination of power structure based upon examination of the activity of community leaders. The three major methodological approaches have been:

1. The study of a single set of community influentials from the viewpoint that they are responsible for major community decisions.

   Conclusion - business leaders are the "ruling elite"

2. The perception of power structure by finding how specific persons and groups behave in regard to specific community issues and decisions.

   Conclusion - there exists a pluralistic system of decision making

3. Investigation of forces changing the character of those in positions of potential power[26]

Through most recent studies and underlying all three methodologies runs a consistent ideological question:

> "Whether the community is governed informally by an economic elite or whether the dominant pattern is political pluralism, a situation where decision-makers represent groups with differing interests."[27]

According to Peter H. Rossi, recent studies of community power structure have demonstrated at least four basic patterns which include the "Conclusions" of 1. and 2. above:

1. The pyramid, or ruling elite
2. Caucus rule (a small number of men belonging to the caucus arrive at a consensus and make important decisions)
3. The polylith, or the pluralistic system
4. The amorphous structure[28]

The first of the four patterns above, however, is more and more questioned by social scientists. D. I. Cline is typical of sociological opinion in his statement that "The concept of a governing elite in cities has waned, and the pluralistic view has gained acceptance."[29]

Two recent articles, "Substance and Artifact: the Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure" by John Walton and "Power and Community Structure: Who Governs, Where and When?" by Terry N. Clark, are very useful, more specific summaries of methodologies in the field. Walton uses charts indicating the general subjects, methodologies, and findings of significant recent community studies in an attempt to provide a clear, systematic view of the state of the discipline in order to determine what valid generalizations can be made as guidelines for future comparative studies. His charts do not lend themselves to compression, and his explanations of them are so tightly worded and necessary to their understanding that it seems best to quote from his article in full.

TABLE 1

COMPARATIVE OUTLINE OF STUDIES OF COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE*

Community	Region	< 10,000	10,000-50,000	50,000-100,000	> 100,000	Industrialized	Non-industrialized	Diversified Economy	Narrow Economy	Absentee Ownership	Increasing Population	Stable Population	Heterogeneous Population	Homogeneous Population	Integration	Cleavage	Reputational	Two-step	Positional	Decision-making	Combined	Case Study	Non-governmental	Governmental	Pyramidal	Factional	Coalitional	Amorphous	Leadership Group (N)
1. Regional City	S				X	X		X				X	X			X	X	X					X		X				
2. Loraine	NC+			X		X			X			X	X		X		X	X				X		X		X			
3. Red Wing	NC		X			X		X				X		X			X									X			
4. Big Town	S				X	X		X		X	X		X		X							X						X	
5. Community A	NC			X		X			X		X			X			X	X					X		X				
6. Bakerville	S	X					X		X			X	X			X	X	X					X		X				
7. Bennington	NE		X				X	X				X		X			X	X			X			X		X			
8. Pacific City	W				X	X		X						X			X	X					X		X				
English City	...				X	X		X						X			X	X					X		X				
9. Cibolia	NC		X			X			X	X	X			X			X	X	X				X		X	X			
10. Seattle	W				X	X		X		X				X									X			X			
11. Springdale	NE	X					X				X			X								X			X				
12. New Haven	NE				X	X		X				X	X		X				X	X		X		X					
13. El Paso	S				X								X				X						X			X			
C. Juarez	...				X								X				X						X			X			
14. Tia Juana	...				X								X				X	X					X						
15. Northville	W		X				X	X			X		X			X	X	X	X				X		X				
16. Miami (Dade County)	S				X		X				X											X		X					
17. Sanford	S				X	X			X		X		X			X	X							X					
Amory	S			X			X	X			X		X			X	X							X					
Algona	S		X				X	X			X		X			X	X												
Gretna	S			X		X			X		X					X	X												
Milton	NC		X				X					X		X			X												
Norwood	NE		X			X			X	X		X		X			X										X		
18. Service City	W												X	X			X					X				X			
19. Syracuse	NE				X	X		X		X	X		X		X					X			X			X			
20. Syracuse	NE				X	X		X		X	X		X		X								X			X			
21. Dixie City	S			X							X		X			X							X			X			
22. Community A	NC			X		X			X			X	X		X								X			X			
23. Cerebrille	NC		X			X		X						X			X	X					X		X				
24. Burlington	S		X			X		X			X		X			X	X	X				X				X			
25. Watertown	S				X		X	X						X			X	X				X							
26. Centralia	S				X		X	X						X			X	X				X							74
27. Orange Point	S	X					X		X		X		X			X						X							61
28. Floriana	S		X				X		X			X	X			X						X							
29. Center City	S			X		X		X			X		X			X						X							
30. Eastborne	S	X					X		X			X		X									X						
31. Westborne	S		X				X		X		X			X									X						
32. Dorado	S	X					X		X		X			X								X							
33. Hiberna	S																						X						
34. Estiva	S																						X						
35. Dallas	S				X	X		X			X			X			X	X					X						
36. Wheelsburg	NC			X		X		X		X	X			X			X	X					X						67
37. Edgewood	NE	X					X		X					X			X	X	X				X						78
38. Riverview	NE	X					X		X				X				X			X			X			X			36
39. Midway County	S	X					X										X			X			X						35
40. River County	S			X													X			X			X						20
41. Beach County	S		X														X						X			X			38
42. Southern County	S																X						X						18
43. Atlanta	S				X	X		X				X	X										X						8
44. Farmdale	W	X					X																X			X			133
45. Oretown	W		X			X			X		X			X			X			X			X						14
46. Petropolis	S			X		X		X			X		X				X			X			X			X			38
47. Metroville	S			X		X		X			X		X				X			X			X			X			61
48. Oberlin	NC	X																		X			X						41

Table 1 summarizes thirty-three studies dealing with fifty-five communities.* The information that it contains regarding research method, community characteristics, and a type of power structure has been distilled from each separate study and, for that reason, loses somewhat in comparability. This difficulty has been met in two ways. When studies are not explicit on certain aspects, no entry is made in the table. Second, it is believed that the categories used in the summary are sufficiently general to provide reasonable comparability for present purposes.

A brief description of the variables with which we will be concerned should demonstrate the point.

A. Community Characteristics

The demographic and economic characteristics in Table 1-region, population size and composition, extent of industrialization and economic base-are self-explanatory.

B. Method

Studies of community power have relied on three distinct methods: the reputational, the decision-making, and the case study. Actual use of these three usually involves some variations which are more difinitively encompassed with the following fivefold classification.

1. Reputational methods

a) Reputational-informants are asked to identify the most influential people in the community when it comes to getting things done. Here leaders are nominated directly in a one-step procedure.

---

*The identifying names of each community in Table 1 are those used in the study; frequently they are pseudonyms.

b) Reputational, two-step-informants are given lists, assembled by various means, of purportedly influential leaders and asked to evaluate them in terms of influence (usually by narrowing the list or ranking its members).

2. Positional methods

a) Positional-leaders are taken to be those persons occupying important positions in formal and/or informal organizations.

b) Positional and Reputational-a combination of 1 a and 2 a.

3. Decision-making approach (event or issue analysis)

a) Decisions-the focus is on specific community issues, and leaders are those persons active or instrumental in the resolution.

4. Case-study method

a) Case study-methods are less explicit; usually the community and leadership are analyzed as a process.

5. Combined approaches

a) Combined-simultaneous use of the above, especially 1 b and 3.

C. Issues

This category designates the area of influence with which the study is chiefly concerned.

1. Governmental-influence in matters of public jurisdiction, for example, nominations and campaigns, bond issues, public works.

2. Nongovernmental-influence in matters of private jurisdiction, for example, general community policy, new industry.

D. Community Power Structure*

1. Pyramidal-monolithic, monopolistic, or a single concentrated leadership group.

2. Factional-at least two durable factions.

3. Coalitional-fluid coalitions of interest usually varying with issues.

4. Amorphous-absence of any persistent pattern of leadership.

HYPOTHESES

The organization of studies provided in Table 1 enables testing at least on the basis of a substantial portion of the literature, a number of hypotheses that have been advanced in more limited contexts. The nine hypotheses employ community power structure as the dependent variable and are arranged under three categories of independent variables. They are derived from a number of sources with occasional modification in order to keep the list to a manageable size and to provide conceptual equivalence with the data.

A. Methodological Characteristics

1. The reputational method tends to identify pyramidal power structures, while the decision-making approach discovers factional and coalitional power structures.

2. The two-step reputational method tends to produce a pyramidal description of power structure more frequently than the direct-nomination procedure.

3. Studies focusing on governmental issues tend to find factional and coalitional structures, while a focus on nongovernmental issues more frequently results in a pyramidal description.

---

*Except for some difference in emphasis in types 2 and 3, this typology closely resembles that offered by Peter H. Rossi, "Power and Community Structure," Midwest Journal of Political Science, IV (November, 1960), 390-401.

4. Comparative studies tend to find factional and coalitional power structures.

B. Demographic Characteristics

1. Socially integrated, heterogeneous populations have less concentrated power structures.

2. Regional differences obtain.

C. Economic Characteristics

1. The more industrialized the community, the less concentrated its power structure.

2. Communities with high proportion of absentee ownership tend to have less concentrated power structures.

3. The more diversified the economic base, the less concentrated the power structure.

RESULTS

Table 2 illustrates the association between research and power structure.* Hypotheses A1, A2 and A3 are confirmed. The reputational method tends to identify pyramidal structures while decision-making and combined methods reflect factional, coalitional, and amorphous types. Further, when the reputational method is used, either exclusively or in combination with some other, the two-step procedure indicates pyramidal structures. Third, when nongovernmental areas of influence are of chief concern, pyramidal structures more frequently obtain than when the

---

*Where, for purposes of statistical analysis, the categories have been collapsed, pyramidal forms one and factional, coalitional, and amorphous the other. The decision-making and combined methods are taken as one category here since the intention is to contrast the reputational approach with alternative ones. Problems in the interpretation of this finding result from the fact that the reputational method characteristically is concerned with influence in non-governmental matters of general community policy. Looking only at reputational studies, there are not enough cases dealing with influence in governmental matters to provide support for hypotheses A3, although the available data reflect a more even distribution among power-structure types.

TABLE 2

RESEARCH METHOD AND COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE

	Pyramidal	Factional	Coalitional Amorphous*	Total†
Method:				
Reputational	13	7	7	27
Decision-making-combined	2	4	8	14
Total	15	11	15	41
	$X^2(2X2)_p < .05$‡			
Reputational method:§				
One-Step	2	5	3	10
Two-step	13	5	7	25
Total	15	10	10	35
	Fisher exact$_p$ = .072			
Area of influence:				
Non-governmental	11	4	3	18
Governmental	5	9	12	26
Total	16	13	15	44
	$X^2(2X2)_p < .02$			
Scope of study:				
One community	7	7	11	25
Two or more communities	12	10	8	30
Total	19	17	19	55
	Not significant			

*The coalitional and amorphous categories are combined because of frequent small N's in the latter and because both represent the absence of any concentration of power, thereby satisfying the purposes of this analysis.

†The N's here and in the table that follows vary because the studies do not uniformly provide data on each variable.

‡The X^2 test is employed here with the recognition that the assumption of independent cell frequencies is not fully met, since over half of the communities were investigated in conjunction with at least one other. This consideration did not seem important enough to dispense with an otherwise useful technique.

§The N here is inflated because studies employing either the one-step or two-step reputational method in combination with the decision-making approach are included in the analysis.

TABLE 3

COMMUNITY CHARACTERISTICS AND COMMUNITY POWER STRUCTURE

	Pyramidal	Factional	Coalitional-Amorphous	Total
Social integration:				
Integration	0	2	4	6
Cleavage	8	4	3	15
Total	8	6	7	21
	Fisher exact p = .032			
Region:				
Northeast	1	2	5	8
North Central	1	5	3	9
South	14	8	7	29
West	3	0	3	6
Total	19	15	18	52
Industrialization:				
Industrialized	7	7	11	25
Non-industrialized	10	6	3	19
Total	17	13	14	44
	x^2 .10$<p<$.05			
Industry ownership:				
Absentee owned	0	2	6	8
Locally owned	7	5	5	17
Total	7	7	11	25
	Fisher exact p = .040			
Economic base:				
Diversified	10	5	9	24
Narrow	6	7	3	16
Total	16	12	12	40

focus is on governmental areas. Hypotheses A4 is rejected, comparative studies showing no significant departure from the results of single case studies.

Hypotheses B1 and B2 are not clearly supported although the data in Table 3 show tendencies in that direction. A socially integrated population may tend to be associated with a less concentrated power structure. Regional differences are somewhat clearer with the northeast and north central regions, reflecting less concentration of power than is found in the South.

Although the levels of significance are not striking, mere inspection of the data on the economic variables provides some support for hypotheses C1 and C2, although in the case of C3 the data are inconclusive.

Summary of Results of Concern to Researchers Follow

1. "The type of power structure identified by studies that rely on a single method may well be artifacts of that method." (Relationship between the two is stronger when the "combined" cases are left out of the analysis).
2. "Social integration and region, variables which reflect something of the political life of the community, show some association with power structure."
3. "Economic variables reflecting patterns characteristic of increasing industrialization are moderately associated with less concentrated power structures."

Suggestions for a Comparative Method

Findings presented in this article are tentative; and are not based on a large enough sample of communities.

One of the chief problems in this field as in others is the accurate and satisfactory treatment of "The diverse social and political facets of community life in a comparative design." Implied in this sharpening of focus are procedural guidelines for the future:

1. Comparative studies should use samples stratified with regard to demographic and economic characteristics.
2. More attention should be focused on change, especially as regards metropolitan development and larger governmental units.
3. Need for development of an abbreviated combination of reputational and decision-making techniques, in order to guard against the type of bias observed to limit previous research.

Absence of a comparative methodology is the major obstacle to adequate community sociology or the sociology of community power at this time.[30]

In his concluding remarks Walton emphasizes the tentative nature of his findings and urges that the methodological obstacles to adequate community sociology be transcended.[31]

We have seen Clark's proposal for classification of communities by AGIL typology, an approach he feels will eliminate much of the confusion in comparative study of communities. This proposal is a partial answer to Walton's challenge to his colleagues to take into account demographic and economic characteristics of communities studied in comparative work.[32] Clark asserts that "Restating the problem in this fashion focuses on the variables distinguishing one community from the next which tend to be associated with one or another type of power structure." To illustrate this theory and to provide guidelines for research, he has developed a series of tentative propositions, to be taken as hypotheses,

which relate tendencies toward different types of power structure with the variables distinguished in the AGIL typology. The variables can be characterized in the following way:

1. All are stochastic (if x, then probably y)
2. None is deterministic (if x, then always y)
3. Most are sequential (if x, then later y)
4. Most are irreversible (if x, then y, but if z, then also y)
5. Most are contingent (if x, then y, but only if z)

The propositions are grouped according to the AGIL variables and are as follows:

LIST OF PROPOSITIONS

BASIC DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

"1. The larger the number of inhabitants in the community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

2. The larger the community, the larger the number of potential elites that can democratically compete for power.

3. The larger the community, the greater the number of full-time political roles.

4. The larger the community, the more autonomous its political institutions.

5. The more autonomous the political institutions of a community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

6. The larger the community, the more socially heterogeneous its population.

7. The more heterogeneous a community, the greater the possibilities for interlocking memberships and cross-cutting status-sets.

8. The greater the density of cross-cutting status-sets, the more controlled the community conflicts.

9. The larger the community, the less dense the cross-cutting status-sets.

10. The fewer the fundamental lines of cleavage within the community, (ethnic, national, etc.), the more extensive the cross-cutting status-sets.

11. The stronger the intracommunity ties of a community's residents, the more extensive the cross-cutting status-sets.

12. The more diverse the economic structures within the community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

13. The greater the percentage of absentee-owned enterprises in a community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

14. The executives of absentee-owned enterprises tend to withdraw from instrumental community activities and apply their talents to more comsummatory activities.

15. The more immobile a community's enterprises, the more likely their management to participate actively in instrumental as well as consummatory community activities (whether ownership of the enterprises is local or not local).

16. The more geographically stationary the inputs for an enterprise, the more immobile the enterprise.

17. The more the outputs from an enterprise are directed toward a fixed region, the lower the mobility of the enterprise.

ADAPTATION: ECONOMIC VARIABLES

18. The better organized and more active the labor movement in the community, the more pluralistic the power structure-up to the point where the labor organizations exert such extensive influence that other groups withdraw from community activities.

19. The lower the involvement of business elites in community activities beyond a certain minimal point, the smaller the number of competing elites and the less pluralistic the power structure.

20. The smaller the proportion of instrumental decisions made at the local level within private and public enterprises, labor organizations, and government, the more consummatory and pacific the general nature of community life.

21. The smaller the proportion of instrumental decisions made on the local level within any one institution in the community-public or private enterprises, labor organizations, or government-the more consummatory the behavior of the members of that institution with respect to community life.

22. The higher the degree of industrialization in a community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

GOAL ATTAINMENT: LEGAL AND POLITICAL STRUCTURES

23. The larger the number of governmental statuses in a community filled according to nonpartisan electoral procedures, the more dominant are the wealthy in decision-making.

24. The larger the number of full-time nonelected officials in the community government, the more pluralistic the community (up to a certain point).

INTEGRATION
POLITICAL PARTIES
AND
VOLUNTARY
ORGANIZATIONS

25. The greater the structural support within the community for a plurality of competing elites, the more pluralistic the power structure.

26. The greater the density of voluntary organizations in the community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

27. The greater the number of effective competing political parties for factions within a single party in a one-party community), the more pluralistic the power structure.

28. The greater the participation of community members in political parties and voluntary organizations, the greater their ego-involvement in community life.

29. The greater the ego-involvement in community life, the more complete the internalization of community values, norms, and traditions.

30. The more complete the internalization by community members of community values, norms, and traditions, the less likely is violent community conflict to occur.

LATENT PATTERN

MAINTENANCE
AND TENSION

MANAGEMENT:
CULTURAL AND
EDUCATIONAL
VARIABLES

31. The more paternalistic the value system of elite groups in the community, the greater their involvement in community affairs.

32. The more pluralistic the value system of members of the community, the more pluralistic the power structure.

33. The higher the educational level of community residents, the more pluralistic the power structure.

34. The higher the prestige of a social status, the more likely are its occupants to rank high in the community power structure."[33]

Both Walton's and Clark's summaries are significant in their implications for future work in community study, and Clark's especially can be used as a tentative guideline in approaching community problems and action.

One further methodological proposal of significance ought to be mentioned here. It is a series of three new approaches to community study developed by Arensberg and Kimball:

1. System analysis
2. Interaction analysis
3. Event analysis[34]

System analysis is based upon the idea of a system as

> "...composed of a number of individuals united by ordered relations, existing in time and space, each individual responding in a customary manner towards others within the system (or outsiders or events which impinge on the system), the nature of the interaction (ordered relations and customs) being an expression of the values affected by the situation, or event which stimulated the response.[35]

Interaction analysis sees an event as a "time-measured sequence of action on the part of persons acting in a recordable order," and the relation between two people is the total of such events observed to occur between them.[36]

When we move from general discussions of research in community studies like those of Walton, Clark, and Arensberg and Kimball, to specific research projects and the resulting discoveries and/or theories, we find the field uneven. Some areas such as community leadership are the foci of a good many studies, whereas others such as the nature and roles of voluntary organizations seem to be neglected. The attempt will be made here to arrive at a reasonable, brief synthesis of significant research in the past five years, moving from broad areas of community structure to more specific ones.

The stratification of society and of its units by socioeconomic class has received a fair amount of sociological attention for many years. Alan F. Blum has contributed an article called "Social Structure, Social Class and Participation in Primary Relationships" which dispells some common stereotypes about class characteristics and offers an illuminating analysis of the differences in social structures in working-class and middle-class life. Blum summarizes his conclusions in the following list, which implicitly and explicitly contrasts the working class with the middle class.

1. The working-class married male is subjected to a stronger set of sanctions and normative controls than the middle-class married male because close-knit social networks exert greater degrees of control over behavior.

2. The greater the degree of control to which a person is subject, the less variability he exhibits in his behavior.

3. Structual undifferentiation is more characteristic of close-knit than of loose-knit networks, and the more undifferentiated a social system, the more effectively it mobilizes the loyalties of its members.

4. Individuals who have attachments with undifferentiated groups are more vulnerable to cross-pressuring situations, which can be avoided only through their withdrawal from participation in other types of groups whose normative directives are inconsistent with the directives issued by their highly valued undifferentiated systems.

5. The working classes should be less likely to make new friendships at the primary level than the middle classes, because such friendships must be incorporated into their social networks. In close-knit networks, such incorporation requires the tacit assent of a community of others, thereby reducing the control which the individual exercises in his selection of new friends.

6. The working classes are less likely to become involved in primary relationships with co-workers and others, because such relationships serve as potential sources of normative conflict with their social networks.

7. The working classes are less likely to innovate in terms of occupational or geographic mobility, because such innovations constitute threats to the solidarity of the close-knit network.

8. The working classes are more likely to be isolated from activities, issues, and associations at the level of the community and larger society because their close-knit networks minimize their contacts with others different from themselves, and prevent the cultivation of loyalties to other social systems.

9. The working classes are more likely than the middle classes to experience dissatisfaction with their marriages because the close-knit network increasingly becomes their primary source of gratifications.[37]

Researchers concerned about cooperative activities involving the above groups should pay special attention to items 4 through 9. As Walton, Clark, and others have shown, research in community power structure is the victim of methodological confusion. It seems that the methods used in research tend to include within their structures predispositions toward a certain result. Structure varies from community to community, depending upon demographic and ecological variables, thus making comparative study difficult. The conclusions and proposals of Walton, Clark, and Arensberg and Kimball must stand as the only meaningful, general comments on the situation.

A major emphasis in the study of power structure has been the examination of community leadership and the activities of leaders as the bases for making structural conclusions. Methods for determining leaders in a community vary, but some form of attribution is usually employed; that is, leaders are at least partially discovered according to reputation. This method has been widely

criticized in the past, for obvious reasons. Nevertheless, it has been fairly well established that reputation is a valuable indicator of leadership, when used in combination with other methods which act as a check upon that process. Kent M. Jennings, Delbert C. Miller and James L. Dirksen have worked quite successfully with the reputational method, checking its validity and modifying its results by two different means. Jennings determined community influentials in Atlanta by asking about thirty prominant citizens to name the most powerful members of the community, by listing major governmental officials, and by finding the most prominent economic leaders in Atlanta. These groups of influentials he called attributed influentials, prescribed influentials, and economic dominants respectively. There was some overlap from group to group, but in the main, these distinctions among kinds of influence and leadership seemed valid.[38] Believing these to be the status-groupings most politically oriented, Jennings proceeeded to observe, examine, research, and analyze the nature of their interests and values and their roles in specific community issues. He found that, with the exception of a few economic dominants, all the influentials were important decision-makers in at least one issue. Some were prominent in a good number of cases, but nowhere did Jennings find evidence that a power elite operated in Atlanta, in contrast to the results of Hunter's classic 1953 study of the same area.

Miller and Dirksen applied the Bonjean-Noland method of identifying leaders used in a study of Burlington, North Carolina, to a small Indiana city and found the method verified by that application. A list of influentials was compiled on the basis of reputation, those influentials were asked to determine the highest ranking members of their group, and thus two rough levels of influence were determined. The groups were then asked to name the ten most influential leaders in the community. It was discovered that the highest ranking leaders named a

significant number of different influentials than did the lower ranking leaders. Leaders named by the highest ranking influentials were called "concealed leaders" on the basis that the high-ranking men would have had enough experience in decision-making to know of important actors not seen by the community at large. Leaders named by the lower ranking influentials but not by the higher ones were called "symbolic leaders" because they were perceived by the community but not by the men actually involved in major decisions and in the resolution of crucial issues. Leaders named by both higher and lower ranking influentials were called "visible leaders" because they were noticed by the community and that perception was verified by those in the "inner circle" of important community actors.[39]

In the Indiana study, visible leaders were found to be prominent and powerful businessmen, concealed leaders represented business and the professions, and symbolic leaders represented quite diverse occupations and tended to represent community values. Three of the latter were symbolic heads of institutional sectors of the community, e.g. college president, mayor, etc. The only difference found between that city and Burlington was that the symbolic leaders in the latter community were members of old, wealthy families.[40] The prominence, real or symbolic, of such families is to be expected in old-fashioned Southern communities because of the tenacity of traditional social patterns.

In the above two studies, as well as in most recent research, the stereotype of the power and dominance of wealth has been challenged. Donald A. Clelland and William H. Form in "Economic Dominants and Community Power, a Comparative Analysis" report the results of a study of a satellite city and an independent city as to the roles of economic dominants in community power structure. Their findings corroborate the trend of sociological opinion, for they report that "...in both communities the formal political and economic power structures

which were once melded have tended to become bifurcated over time."[41] Economic dominants in both communities have withdrawn from community power activism; their participation has declined from its dominant position at the turn of the century. Clelland and Form see this process as roughly coinciding with the rapid increase in absentee ownership of business and industry in both cities,[42] a phenomenon which we previously saw emphasized in Dentler. Bifurcation did not seem to be as extreme in the independent city, perhaps because it is not as characteristic of the urban trend of contempory American society discussed by Dentler and others earlier.

Edward C. Banfield and James Q. Wilson in "Conflicts and Issues in City Politics" provide another perspective on community structure - that of organizational participation in civic issues. The two major functions of city government, as seen by Banfield and Wilson, are service and conflict resolution, hence the government is not seen as innovative.[43] In urban communities, organizations (or individuals acting in organizational roles) rather than individuals participate in civic affairs because, "The participation of individuals in politics tends to be reduced where strong organizations exist...."[44] The reason given is the argument that "organizations are impelled by a dynamic, imminent in the process of organization, to select and manage issues in ways that individuals do not."[45] Ad hoc organizations, as well as permanent ones, participate in urban politics, but it is the latter which have the more prominent role.

The permanent organizations which play continuing roles in city politics are of five general kinds: (1) the press; (2) other business firms, especially department stores and the owners and managers of real estate; (3) the city bureaucracy; (4) voluntary (or "civic") associations; and (5) labor unions.

Banfield and Wilson argue that, although issues sometimes are created by politicians or voluntary organizations, they are usually originated by permanent organizations which hope to gain materially by them. An interesting pattern of involvement appears common: the "prime-moving" organization creating the issue and working for its resolution in certain terms usually works through a "front" organization rather than directly under its own name. Often voluntary organizations with utopian purposes are used as fronts, perhaps in order that the material interest of the prime-mover will remain unknown. The role of the chief prescribed influential, e.g. the mayor, is usually limited to a presiding one. Banfield and Wilson see this tendency in most large cities and imply that the idea of the bold, vigorous mayor is based on misconceptions and is an unwise one to aspire to. The mayor usually acts, and ought to act, as an arbitrator whose function is to resolve conflict in civic issues.[46]

Saul Alinsky, Director of the Industrial Areas Foundation, agrees in theory with Banfield and Wilson's conclusions. Alinsky maintains that the resolution of civic issues is a negotiating or bargaining process and understands the power of permanent organizations whose vested interests make it difficult for voluntary and ad hoc groups to make their demands heard and heeded in the power structure. The solution to this problem, he feels, is power blocs of citizens who will engineer power conflicts on the basis of their ideas of the need for change.[47] Dentler urges caution in the use of power blocs, arguing (1) that they may not be truly representative of the community, (2) under certain conditions they intensify general community conflict, and (3) they seldom offer specific constructive proposals but concentrate instead on militant expressions of grievances.[48]

Relevant to these problems of community structure and issue resolution is a classification of types of power, used by Jennings in the previously mentioned

study of Atlanta. Power can be seen as either intentional or potential. Intentional power falls into three categories:

1. Positive power - power exerted directly and positively
2. Veto power - direct negative power
3. Filter power - the power to acquaint holders of positive and veto power with given issues and involve them in resolution of those issues. A person exercising filter power might gather a coalition of influentials and engineer their involvement in an issue, on a particular side of the conflict.[49]

Bureaucracies and primary groups are the two extreme types of individual organizations within the community. Eugene Litwak has attempted "...to develop a theory of primary group and bureaucratic functions" in "Technological Innovation and Theoretical Functions of Primary Groups and Bureaucratic Structures." Although Litwak believes Weber to have been correct in postulating that monocratic bureaucracies are the most effective organizations for accomplishing many goals in a mass industrial society, he disagrees with Weber's idea that bureaucracies and primary groups are mutually exclusive. Litwak believes that there is a continuum between these extreme poles of human organization and that primary groups exist all along it, that they exist <u>within</u> bureaucracies.[50] The two types of organization have distinct areas of effectiveness.

I. BUREAUCRACIES have structural features which make them incomparably better for dealing with problems that require trained experts or concentrated resources. They are more effective in the accomplishment of uniform tasks.

II. PRIMARY GROUPS are much more effective when trained expertise or concentrated resources are not essential. Faster feedback is possible in primary groups, and members of the group are in continuous touch in many different areas of life (diffused relations). Thus communication is relatively accurate, and the primary group is more flexible than bureaucracy. (Speed of communication can be a defect, however, when primary groups lack knowledge because it can reinforce ignorance). The primary group, because of its flexibility, is more effective at non-uniform tasks.[51]

One final study is deserving of mention because it raises crucial questions, not only about the necessary nature of organizations, but also about the nature of all social institutions and about the nature of man himself. Melvin Tumin has written an article called "Business as a Social System" in which he presents a Hobbsian view of man as naturally cruel, solitary, self-seeking, irrational and morally unstable. The function of society and its organizations is in part that of inhibiting these characteristics and fostering the community values considered ideal. Tumin opposes the myths of organizations such as the myth of infallibility, the myth of necessary bias, the myth of the sacredness of the status quo nunc et ante to overt principles of conduct such as the principle of least morality, the principle of least effort and least participation, the principle of least unity, etc.[52] While there may be considerable truth in Tumin's ideas, he writes generally, without substantiating his assertions. They do not shed significant theoretical light on the specific structures and operations of organizations. They seem to ignore commonly accepted principles of human psychology such as gregariousness, affection, natural desires for cooperation, and desires for competency and achievement.

CONCLUSIONS

Approaches to community action and change based on the selected review materials suggested awareness of the following:

1. Recognition of characteristics of socioeconomic class, e.g., lower classes need to be pressured from outside, because of their indisposition to change
2. Situations in which primary group action is more effective than bureaucratic action, and vice versa
3. Discovery of leaders by the methods previously discussed, in order to enlist their aid. Use of filter power. Focus on the highest attributed influentials and prescribed influentials
4. Use of block power in bringing issues to public notice and forcing some action.

Community cooperation is a technique for reforming established social institutions. It is well to remember that preceeding materials reviewed are descriptive entries and say little about techniques available to the current crop of researchers interested in the complete invention to adoption continuum developed by Guba. Several specific suggestions follow with notations which report actual efforts at cooperative agency efforts to create change.

<u>Reorganization of Established Agencies</u>:

1. Field Paper #11 - (A program involving 38 agencies to facilitate better medical service)
2. ComField Project- (A Model Teacher Education Project involving 40 agencies)

3. The best example at the national level is New York City's reorganization of 50 city departments into ten major administrations. Compton School District and allied agencies in Compton, California represent another fine example of how reorganization of functions within established agencies may facilitate educational change.

Government intervention via guidelines developed around broad categorical aid areas offer the most effective impetus to change.

Decentralization:

The regional medical programs currently developing offer the best evidence of decentralization. The East Harlem Block School in the field of education has also given evidence of this approach. The New School for Children in the Roxbury Community in Boston is an excellent example of decentralization stimulated and completed by people not in an agency or part of the establishment. The Green Power in Los Angeles provides training for hard core unemployed and is an outstanding example of a decentralized approach to facilitating community agencies in their efforts to resolve such problems.

Institutional Reform via Changing the Composition of the Agencies Work Force:

The Model Cities program typifies an interagency approach to changing the work force composition. Portland's Model Cities program, desirous of research, evaluation and planning skills for example, is using NWREL personnel, Urban Studies Center personnel (Portland State) as well as state and county personnel to facilitate the change efforts of the local citizens. Lacking this infusion of different personnel the Model Cities program may have faltered. The introduction of ethnic diversity and subprofessional career lines (teacher, police, nurse aides and the like) also facilitates institutional change. This type of intragency change is often more lasting than weak and ill-defined interagency efforts.

Introduction of Analytical and System Techniques to Management, Planning, Budgeting: can create an awareness of ways agencies might cooperate. For example, the University of Oregon Medical School and NWREL are developing relationships because budget factors prohibit one agency from maintaining a full-time educational researcher and the other agency from supporting a full time M.D. for advisement on medically based learning problems. NWREL has a descriptive model (Field Paper #16, 13 p.) available upon request which employs a systematic effort to research problems across 38 agencies involved in a cooperative agency project.

A final technique useful in cooperative approaches is to have the external change agent work specifically with the administrative staff of the agency. Work with the administrators on techniques of isolating poor or inefficient working sections of the agency. Robert MacNamara's work with administrators of the Defense Department and university consultant work with chief state or local superintendents would be examples of this approach.

The preceeding notations and the following reference materials are included for the reader who may elect to write to the authors or site for specifics.

Community change agents seeking change through cooperative approaches must read their local situation carefully. Circumstances will differ and will determine whether the prime emphasis of a given participating agency at a given time should be organizing the community, planning and research, training, or programmatic analysis of participants.

The approach is complex and oversimplification may lead to false security. The intent of this writer is to expose the reader to works not normally reviewed by educators so that the cautions may be "real" cautions and not excuses for inactivity.

FOOTNOTES

1. Clark, T. N. "Power and Community Structure: Who Governs, Where and When?" Sociological Quarterly. 8: 291-316, Summer, 1967. p. 292.

2. Ibid, p. 293.

3. Arensberg, Conrad M. and Solon T. Kimball. "Community Study: Retrospect and Prospect." American Journal of Sociology. Vol 73, No. 6, May, 1968. p. 695.

4. Dentler, Robert A. American Community Problems. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968. p. 21.

5. Swift, D. F. "Critique of the Concepts of Community Development." International Journal of Comparative Sociology. 6: 241-55, September, 1965. p. 249.

6. Dentler, p. 21.

7. Ibid, pp. 26-27.

8. Ibid, p. 21.

9. Ibid, pp. 26-27.

10. Ibid, p. 39.

11. Ibid, pp. 40-41.

12. Ibid, p. 52.

13. Hauser, Philip M. and Martin Taitel. "Population Trends - Prologue for Educational Programs." Prospective Changes in Society by 1980, ed. Edgar L. Morphet, Director and Charles O. Ryan, Associate Director, Designing Education for the Future: An Eight-State Project. Denver, Colorado. New York: Citation Press, 1967. p. 24.

14. Ibid, p. 37.

15. Ibid, p. 37.

16. Ibid, p. 41.

17. Friedman, John and John Miller in Dentler, p. 28.

18. Elazar, Daniel J. "The American Partnership: The Next Half Generation." Prospective Changes in Society by 1980. etc. p. 111.

19. Ibid, p. 111.

20. Ibid, p. 114.

Footnotes (con't)

21. Ibid, p. 115.

22. Wheaton, William L. L. "Urban and Metropolitan Development." Prospective Changes in Society by 1980, etc. pp. 143-144.

23. Ibid, pp. 145-151.

24. Arensberg and Kimball, p. 691.

25. Ibid, p. 693.

26. Clelland D. A. and W. H. Form, "Economic Dominants and Community Power: A Comparative Analysis." American Journal of Sociology, 69: 511-21, March, 1964. p. 511.

27 Ibid, p. 511.

28. Rossi, Peter H. in D. I. Cline, "Assessing Community Groups and Group Forces." Public Management, 46: 108-12, May, 1964. p. 109.

29. Cline, p. 108.

30. Walton, J. "Substance and Artifact: The Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure." American Journal of Sociology, 71: 430-8, January, 1966. pp. 431-438.

31. Ibid, p. 438.

32. Ibid, p. 439.

33. Clark, pp. 294-316.

34. Arensberg and Kimball, p. 701.

35. Ibid, p. 701.

36. Ibid, p. 702.

37. Blum, Alan F. "Social Structure, Social Class, and Participation in Primary Relationships." The Dynamics of Modern Society, ed. William J. Goode. New York: Atherton Press, 1966. pp. 82-83.

38. Jennings, Kent M. Community Influentials; the Elites of Atlanta. New York: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964. p. 19.

Footnotes (con't)

39. Miller D.C. and J. L. Dirksen. "Identification of Visible, Concealed, and Symbolic Leaders in a Small Indiana City." Social Forces, 43: 548-55, May 1965. p. 548.

40. Ibid, p. 552.

41. Clelland and Form, p. 520.

42. Ibid, p. 520.

43. Banfield, Edward C. and James Q. Wilson, "Conflicts and Issues in City Politics." Social Organization and Behavior, ed. Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson. p. 383.

44. Ibid, p. 386.

45. Ibid, p. 386.

46. Ibid, pp. 388-389.

47. Alinsky, discussed in Dentler, p. 83.

48. Dentler, p. 86.

49. Jennings, p. 20.

50. Litwak, Eugene. "Technological Innovation and Theoretical Functions of Primary Groups and Bureaucratic Structures." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 73, p. 468.

51. Ibid, pp. 472-479.

52. Tumin, Melvin. "Business as a Social System." The Dynamics of Modern Society, ed. William J. Goode. New York: Atherton Press, 1966. pp. 134-141.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arensberg, Conrad M. and Solon T. Kimball. "Community Study: Retrospect and Prospect." American Journal of Sociology. Vol. 73, No. 6, May 1968.

Banfield, Edward C. and James Q. Wilson. "Conflicts and Issues in City Politics." Social Organization and Behavior, ed. Richard L. Simpson and Ida Harper Simpson. New York: Wiley, 1964.

Blum, Alan F. "Social Structure, Social Class, and Participation in Primary Relationships." The Dynamics of Modern Society, ed. William J. Goode. New York, Atherton Press, 1966.

Brooks, M. P. "Community Action Program as a Setting for Applied Research." Journal of Social Issues, 21: 29-40, January 1965.

Clark, T. N. "Power and Community Structure: Who Governs, Where, and When?" Sociological Quarterly, 8: 291-316, Summer 1967.

Clelland, D. A. and W. H. Form. "Economic Dominants and Community Power: A Comparative Analysis." American Journal of Sociology, 69: 511-21, March 1964.

Cline, D. I. "Assessing Community Groups and Group Forces." Public Management, 46: 108-12, May 1964.

Dentler, Robert A. American Community Problems. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1968.

Elazar, Daniel J. "The American Partnership: The Next Half Generation." Prospective Changes in Society by 1980 etc.

Hauser, Philip M. and Martin Taitel. "Population Trends - Prologue for Educational Programs." Prospective Changes in Society by 1980, ed. Edgar L. Morphet, Director and Charles O. Ryan, Associate Director, Designing Education for the Future: An Eight-State Project. Denver, Colorado. New York, Citation Press, 1967.

Jennings, Kent M. Community Influentials; the Elites of Atlanta. New York, The Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.

Litwak, Eugene. "Technological Innovation and Theoretical Functions of Primary Groups and Bureaucratic Structures." American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 73, p. 468.

Miller, D.C. and J. L. Dirksen. "Identification of Visible, Concealed and Symbolic Leaders in a Small Indiana City." Social Forces, 43: 548-55, May 1965, Reply C.L. Mulford, 44: 251, December 1965.

Swift, D.F. "Critique of the Concepts of Community Development." International Journal of Comparative Sociology, 6: 241-55, September 1965.

Tumin, Melvin. "Business as a Social System." The Dynamics of Modern Society, ed. William J. Goode. New York, Atherton Press, 1966.

Walton, J. "Substance and Artifact: the Current Status of Research on Community Power Structure." American Journal of Sociology, 71: 430-8, January 1966.

Wheaton, William L. L. "Urban and Metropolitan Development." Prospective Changes in Society by 1980, etc.

Young, R. C. and O. F. Larson. "Contribution of Voluntary Organizations to Community Structure." American Journal of Sociology, 71: 178-86, September 1965.

OTHER REFERENCE MATERIALS

AVAILABLE FROM NORTHWEST REGIONAL EDUCATIONAL LABORATORY (NWREL)

Giammatteo, Michael C. BACKUP LITERATURE AND RESEARCH PLAN - 200 SERIES. Field Paper No. 12. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, 1967. (Multilith)

_____ CONCEPT OF A MODEL CITY COMPLEX. Field Paper No. 14. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, August 1968. (Multilith)

_____ INNER CITY EDUCATIONAL NEEDS OF YOUTH. Field Paper No. 13. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, 1968. (Multilith)

_____ PARENT EDUCATORS - AN AID FOR TOTAL HEALTH PLANS. Field Paper No. 11. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, November 1967. (Multilith)

_____ PHASE I - DESCRIPTIVE FLOW: PARENT-CHILD CENTERS, Field Paper No. 16. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, September 1968. (Multilith)

_____ PROJECTED THEMES AND PROBLEMS CONCERNED WITH FOLLOW THROUGH. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, 1967. (Draft-Multilith)

_____ SOME RESEARCH RATIONALE NOTATIONS FOR PARENT-CHILD SERVICES. Field Paper No. 10. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, November 1967. (Multilith)

_____ TARGET GROUP ANALYSIS FLOW--EVALUATIVE AIDS. Field Paper No. 9. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, 1967. (Multilith)

_____ TRAINING PACKAGE FOR A MODEL CITY STAFF. Field Paper No. 15. Portland, Oregon: NWREL, November 1968. (Multilith)

Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. TEAM TRAINING FOR FEDERAL AGENCY PERSONNEL--MODEL CITIES PROGRAMS. Response to Request for Proposal. Portland, Oregon: June 1968.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Bennis, Warren G., Kenneth D. Benne, and Robert Chin. The Planning of Change. Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1961.

A volume of readings stressing two aspects of planned change: the change agents and the clients systems. The relationship established between the giver and receiver of help is considered basic to the outcome. "How well the process is understood by each and what degree of openness for examination and for possible reconstruction exists for both parties are, therefore, of central importance."

Carlson, Richard O. "Environmental Constraints and Organizational Consequences: the Public School and Its Clients," in Behavioral Science and Educational Administration, NSSE, 63rd Yearbook, Part II. University of Chicago Press, 1964, pp. 262-76.

A scholarly presentation which develops a typology of organization-client relationships in service organizations and then suggests some of the consequences and implications of the type of relationships clients have with public schools. Develops the notions of wild and domesticated organizations proposing a method of dealing with change in them. Attends to the question: "What mechanisms are used by public school systems to adapt to an unselected clientele?"

Chin, Robert. "Models of and Ideas about Changing," in Media and Educational Innovation, ed. by Wesley C. Meierhenry. University of Nebraska, 1963, pp. 1-22.

Projects a five-category classification of change: substitution, alteration, perturbation and variation, restructuring, and value orientation change. Chin suggests three general change strategies: (1) the empirical-rational types; based on reason utilization, (2) the nominative-reeducative types; based on attitude change, and (3) the power types; based on compliance.

Clark, David L. and E. G. Guba. "An Examination of Potential Change Roles in Education," in Rationale Planning in Curriculum and Instruction. NEA Center for the Study of Instruction, 1967, pp. 111-33.

Section I develops a logical structure for examining change roles in education. Divides the innovation process in four parts: research, development, diffusion, and adoption. Describes each stage in detail with recommendations for action.

Cunningham, Luvern L. "Viewing Change in School Organizations," Administrator's Notebook, v. 11, no. 1, September, 1962.

Develops four major concepts instrumental in effective change; social system, change agent, diagnosis, and intervention.

Designing Education for the Future: An Eight-State Project. Planning and Effecting Needed Changes in Education; Reports Prepared for the Third Area Conference. Denver, Colorado. The Project, 1967.

Useful papers included: Kenneth Hansen's, "Planning for changes in education;" Robert Chin's, "Basic strategies and procedures in effecting change;" Robert Howsam's, "Effecting needed change in education;" Ralph Kimbrough's "Power structures and educational change;" Don Glines, "Planning and effecting needed changes in individual schools."

Kimbrough, Ralph B. "Community Power Structure and Curriculum Change," in Strategy for Curriculum Change, Robert R. Leeper, ed. ASCD, 1965, pp. 55-71.

What is the nature of power structures in local school districts? Who is likely to wield power affecting innovations? Why do power wielders make decisions? Kimbrough attacks these questions to encourage educators to use the local power structure in innovation.

Lippitt, Ronald, Jeanne Watson and Bruce Westley. Dynamics of Planned Change. Harcourt, Brace, 1958.

Discusses aspects of change and various types of professional workers concerned with it: change agents, the client system, change forces, phases of change, and methods of change.

Lortie, Dan C. "Change and Exchange: Reducing Resistance to Innovation," Administrator's Notebook, v. 12, no. 6, February, 1964.

Argues that social scientific analysis, using the concepts of latent function and exchange, can help the administrator to anticipate and deal with resistance to change.

Meierhenry, W. C., ed. Media and Educational Innovation. University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

A symposium on identifying techniques and principles for gaining acceptance of research results includes contributions by Art Gallaher, "The role of the advocate and directed change;" Paul Meadows, "Novelty and acceptors: a sociological consideration for the acceptance of change;" Wayman Crow, "Characteristics of leaders who are able to promote change;" et al.

Miles, Matthew B., ed. Innovation in Education. Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1964.

A basic reference for the study of change, especially these chapters: "Educational innovation; the nature of the problem," by Matthew Miles; "Title III and the dynamics of educational change in California," by Donald W. Johnson; "Curricular change: participants, power, and processes," by Gordon Mackenzie; "Administrative theory and change in organizations," by Daniel E. Griffiths; "On temporary systems," and "Innovation in education: some generalizations," by Matthew Miles.

Miller, Richard I., ed. "A Multidisciplinary Focus on Educational Change," Bulletin of the Bureau of School Services, v. 38, no. 2, December, 1965. College of Education, University of Kentucky, 1965.

Reports the 1965 Midwest Regional Conference of Elementary Principals with Robert Chin, "Change and human relations;" D. A. Booth, "Change and political realities;" and C. M. Coughenour, "Change and sociological perspectives." The latter discusses the role of the principal in change, stressing the general problems or orientation to change and adaptability as well as the problems of organization and implementation.

Rogers, Everett M. Diffusion of Innovations. Free Press of Glencoe, 1962.

Shows that traditional vs. modern orientations in a particular community or subculture affect adoption rates markedly. Greater personal innovativeness is associated with "cosmopoliteness," (the result of experience in more than one social system). Emphasizes the characteristics of inventions that made them more or less acceptable, such as relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, divisibiligy, and communicability. Lists stages in adoption: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, and adoption.

Saunders, Robert L., Phillips, R. C., and H. T. Johnson. A Theory of Educational Leadership. Charles E. Merrill, 1966.

Delineates the role of the local school in decision-making.

Wiles, Kimball, "Contrasts in Strategies of Change," Strategy for Curriculum Change. ASCD, 1965, pp. 1-10.

Allocates such functions as basic research, field testing, and evaluation to agencies outside the school system and states that innovation occurs outside the school system. Diffusion and intergration occur within the system.